

HENRY COUNTY CENTRAL POINT OF COORDINATION

106 NORTH JACKSON ST. SUITE 102, MT PLEASANT, IA 52641

319-385-4050 FAX 319-385-1948

SARAH KAUFMAN, ADMINISTRATOR

10/11/11

In reviewing the agenda and our work to date there are a few points for the regional workgroup to consider.

There is much talk of resources and pooling them but yet we haven't had a conversation about what the potential cost of the new system will be or even any estimates of resources available. Counties/Regions don't need to contract with the State to spend their own resources so when we talk of regions contracting with the state the system becomes a state run system. It appears that resource issues are to be considered by the Legislative Interim Committee but I don't see where they are getting information to use for their consideration of this most critically important issue. If funding isn't sufficient all of this redesign work has the potential to be irrelevant.

We are having a lot of discussion about what the regions performance accountability but what about I'm not hearing is any discussion about what the states level of accountability will be in this new system and the regions recourse to hold the state accountable. If this is a partnership we should be addressing accountability of both partners equally.

There is talk of regions sharing financial risk but what the counties endured has been cost shifting and unfunded mandates and reduction of the funds promised for cost sharing. The regions have to have some buffer from the issue of waiting lists for populations that will be the states funding responsibility and the providers have to have a buffer from the issue of the state freezing and reducing rates. If rates are based on approved cost reports then they should not be reduced as a form of cost containment.

We are being provided templates for developing regional management plans and annual reports these DHS created templates are what that the counties use in the current system and during this past legislative session these documents brought considerable chastising to the county system and were being identified as a contribution to a broken system. What this tells me is that the county system was an acceptable operating system or we are using the same tools to develop another problematic funding system. Bureau Chief Shultz used the statement 99 counties 99 plans during a public meeting just last week and when an audience member corrected him saying there are not 99 plans his reply was yes I know that. So my question would be what information is being provided to prepare him to talk with the public and why would he choose to use an inaccurate statement. All this does is attempt to make the county system look bad.

Counties currently submit annual reports which are suppose to be a tool for state oversight but for the 10 years I have done this job when those get turned in each December and no useful feedback is provided nor does it look like the data in those reports is pulled into useful information about the system at the state level.

Three or so years back there was 20-25 counties that were audited by the state Auditor's office and my understanding is that no major deficiencies of the county process were identified at the conclusion of those audits. I think that final report should be shared with workgroups, DHS, the county Board of Supervisors and legislators.

Mission Statement

Henry County strives to provide citizens with disabilities the opportunity to receive individualized services, coordinated by qualified team members, that emphasize quality of life, informed choices, and cost effectiveness in the least restrictive environment possible while promoting increased independence and positive involvement with the community.